



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REORGANIZATION OF STATE ADMINISTRATION.

THE nature of the American system of government requires of the citizen a variety of political interests and imposes numerous civic obligations. The two distinct sets of governmental problems, those of the nation and those of the respective States, are frequently dissimilar in their nature and the opinions formed relative to the one have often little application to the other. In recent years, moreover, much public interest has been absorbed in problems of foreign policy and the attention of the voter has been distracted from State and national issues into the more remote and complex field of international relations.

In the midst of these diverse problems, however, those specific to the States have never failed to command a considerable measure of attention from the citizen-body. Despite a consistent tendency towards national centralization during the past half century or more, the American State still remains the basic element in our political life; its authority reaches out and touches the citizen a hundred times to a single instance of national regulation, and on the whole there is a traditional pride and interest in local institutions. Within the past few years, indeed, this interest has asserted itself in the form of a searching analysis of present-day methods of government within the States and in consequence a considerable number have introduced substantial improvements. By the introduction of the executive budget system, more than half the States have gone far towards the establishment of a proper form of public financial administration and set thereby an example which the national government has seen fit to follow. The essential wisdom of this legislation has awakened a desire for more comprehensive readjustment along related lines.

## I.

A problem which is receiving much consideration at the present time is that of the reorganization of State administration. The proposals put forward have not assumed the nature of a zealous and impetuous reform, a desire for change on the basis

of mere problematical advantages; they reflect, on the other hand, the conclusions of men experienced in the study and practical operation of State administration and they have in addition the sanction of successful demonstration in those States where the measures have been adopted. Already a dozen or more States have undertaken the task of administrative reorganization, first by an intensive and scientific study of existing methods, which in practically every instance revealed practices both wasteful and unsystematic, and secondly, by the adoption of constructive measures designed to bring into the proper relationship the two fundamental elements of authority and responsibility.<sup>1</sup>

It may be well to state at the outset that these proposals for administrative reorganization are grounded in certain broad

---

<sup>1</sup> The most extensive and satisfactory administrative reforms have been accomplished in Illinois in 1917; Nebraska and Idaho in 1919; Washington and Ohio in 1921. Less complete administrative reorganization along similar lines has been enacted in California, Michigan, Missouri, and Massachusetts. These States have proceeded on the general theory of improving administrative conditions through the medium of the Governor.

Some degree of administrative consolidation has been effected in New Jersey, New York, Wisconsin, and West Virginia, but these States have vested the general supervision of administration in Commissions or Boards of which the Governor is but one member.

A recent authoritative discussion of the progress in State reorganization and the problem of more efficient State government is that of Walter F. Dodd, *State Administrative Reorganization*, VII JOURNAL, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, 406-414 (August 1921). Brief accounts of reorganization measures enacted in various States in 1920-1921 are given in XV AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, 3-4. A convenient summary is Haines, C. G., *The Movement for the Reorganization of State Administration*, University of Texas Bulletin, No. 1848, August 1918. Bulletin 63, New York Bureau of Municipal Research contains a discussion of proposed amendments for the reorganization of the executive branch before the New York Constitutional Convention. Complete surveys of State administration together with recommendations for reconstruction are given in the Report of Efficiency and Economy Committee of Illinois, 1915; Report of Reconstruction Commission, New York, 1919; Report of Joint Committee on Administrative Reorganization, Ohio, 1921. Textbooks with brief discussions on the general principles of State reorganization are: MATHEWS, JOHN M., *THE PRINCIPLES OF AMERICAN STATE ADMINISTRATION* (Appleton, 1917); HAINES AND HAINES, *PRINCIPLES AND PROBLEMS OF GOVERNMENT* (Harper and Brothers, 1921); KIMBALL, EVERETT, *STATE AND MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES* (Ginn and Company, 1922).

principles which have been widely advocated for general application to State government. These principles represent authoritative opinions as nearly in agreement as can be expected upon questions which by their very nature are open to sincerely diverse judgments. They may here be summarized as a basis for reflection at least and as a standard to which the more specific questions of administrative reorganization may be referred:

In the first place the number of State elective officers should be few in number; it has been widely proposed that they should be reduced to three, the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, and a Controller to act as an independent financial auditor.

This principle embodies the well known idea of the "short ballot" and is endorsed on the belief that the voter is not in a position to appraise properly the qualifications of a large number of candidates at a given time and that a more discriminating choice is made when public scrutiny is concentrated on a restricted number. It implies also that the essence of popular government does not consist in the number of public officials who derive their authority directly from the people but in the readiness with which the latter can definitely fix responsibility upon those entrusted with the conduct of public affairs and in their ability to hold these officials accountable and responsive to the public will.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Ex-President Wilson in a notable address on "Civic Problems" delivered before the Civic League of St. Louis, March 9, 1909 said:

"Elaborate your government; place every officer upon his own dear little statue; make it necessary for him to be voted for; and you will not have a democratic government. Just so certainly as you segregate all these little offices and put every man upon his own statutory pedestal and have a miscellaneous organ of government, too miscellaneous for a busy people either to put together or to watch, public aversion will have no effect on it; and public opinion, finding itself ineffectual, will get discouraged, as it does in this country by finding its assaults like assaults against battlements of air, where they find no one to resist them, where they capture no positions, where they accomplish nothing. You have a grand house cleaning, you have a grand overturning, and the next morning you find the government going on just as it did before you did the overturning. What is the moral? \* \* \* The remedy is contained in one word: *simplification*. Simplify your processes, and you will begin to control; complicate them, and you will get farther and farther away from their control." Quoted in BEARD, AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS (3rd. ed.) 483.

Secondly, with respect to State administration, there should be a consolidation of all administrative departments, commissions, boards, offices and other agencies into a small number of departments each headed by a single official. Within each department all related work should be appropriately grouped into divisions and bureaus responsibility for which should be centralized in an accountable chief.

From this general scheme of consolidation there are to be exempted those administrative services which function in a quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial capacity and those which exercise inspectional or advisory powers. For services of this nature the board type of organization is deemed desirable.

Thirdly, the Governor of the State should be the responsible head for State administration and should be given the power to appoint the heads of the administrative departments, which officials should be associated with him as an executive council or Cabinet. The accountability of these officials to the Governor should be assured through his power to appoint and remove on a basis analogous to that existing in the national government. The terms of these departmental heads should be adjusted with reference to that of the Governor and with the exception of the members of boards having overlapping terms, departmental heads should have the same term as the Governor.

Fourthly, the adoption of the executive budget system vesting in the Governor the full responsibility for presenting to the legislature each year a budget containing all expenditures which in his opinion should be undertaken by the State, and a proposed plan for obtaining the necessary revenues—such a budget to represent the work of the Governor and his Cabinet. Incorporation of all appropriations based upon the budget in a single general appropriation bill.<sup>3</sup>

The principles stated above by no means comprehend all the proposals which have been brought forward for the improvement of State government but they summarize programs which have been widely advocated and partially adopted in many States and require no fundamental or radical change in the basic structure or theory of State

---

<sup>3</sup> The summary with certain modifications is taken from HAINES AND HAINES, *PRINCIPLES AND PROBLEMS OF GOVERNMENT* (Harper and Brothers, 1921) pp. 337-338.

government. The conditions which have prompted the adoption of these programs and their detailed application may conveniently be treated in connection with reorganization measures already enacted in certain States.

## II.

The Administrative Codes adopted in Illinois,<sup>4</sup> 1917 and in Ohio,<sup>5</sup> 1921 may be regarded as representative of recent legislation on the subject. In both of these States the reorganization measures were preceded by extensive investigations of existing administrative methods, studies which revealed a heterogeneous mass of State boards, bureaus, departments and commissions, created from time to time by legislative enactment, but functioning in an uncorrelated and often irresponsible manner. The usual method of approach to the subject has been the appointment of Efficiency and Economy Commissions directed to make a general survey of conditions of administration and commissioned to draft measures for reorganization to the General Assembly. The personnel of these commissions is drawn from the legislative and executive branches of the government and has in addition a number of outside members of special ability and qualifications. Indeed in Illinois, Ohio, and Oregon the work of the investigation commissions was conducted under the general supervision of a specialist who carried out the study with the aid of a staff of expert investigators.<sup>6</sup> It has been the practice to publish the findings of the commissions in a single volume and in a series of pamphlets for popular distribution which summarize the recommendations. In New York, preparatory to the Constitutional Convention of 1915, the New York Bureau of Municipal Research carried out an elaborate investigation on the organization and functions of the State government and its thorough analysis of State administration has been used as a basis for much subsequent investigation.

The results of the surveys, wherever made, have been a revela-

---

<sup>4</sup> Session Laws, 1917.

<sup>5</sup> Session Laws, 1921.

<sup>6</sup> Professor John A. Farlie of the University of Illinois was director of the Illinois Commission, and in Ohio the investigation was conducted under the general supervision of Mr. Don C. Sowers, director of the Akron Bureau of Municipal Research.

tion of disorganization, waste and inefficiency in State administrative services. The multiplication of boards, commissions and bureaus has created a disintegrated system of State administration, nominally under the supervision of the Governor, but so cumbersome and complicated in its organization that the most conscientious executive is unable to exercise an effective control. Upon the general aspects of this situation in Illinois, the Efficiency and Economy Commission reported as follows:

"Under the existing arrangements inefficiency and waste necessarily arise from the lack of correlation and co-operation in the work of the different offices and institutions which are carrying out similar or closely related functions. There are separate boards for each of the state penitentiaries and reformatories and for each of the state normal schools. There are half a dozen boards dealing with agricultural interests and about a score of separate labor agencies, including four boards dealing with mining problems and eight free employment agencies, each substantially independent of each other. State finance administration is distributed between a number of elective and appointive officials and boards without concentrated responsibility. The supervisions of corporations and of banks, insurance companies and public utilities is exercised by a series of distinct departments. State control of public health is divided between various boards with no effective means of co-ordination. Nor is there any official authority for harmonizing the work of the numerous educational agencies."<sup>7</sup>

With regard to the inability of the Governor to exercise any effective supervision over the numerous boards, the Commission reported that:

"As a result of the absence of any systematic organization of related services, there is no effective supervision and control over the various state offices, boards and commissions. It is true that the great number of these are under the nominal supervision of the governor, through his power of appointment and removal. But the varying number of separate offices makes impossible the exercise of any adequate

---

<sup>7</sup> Quoted by Matthews, John M. in *Administrative Reorganization in Illinois*, IX SUPPLEMENT TO THE NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW, No. 11, 742.

control. To a very large extent each authority is left to determine its own action; conflict of authority between two or more offices is often possible; and if harmony and co-operation is secured it is by voluntary compromise rather than by the advice or decision of a superior authority.”<sup>8</sup>

The notable report of the New York Reconstruction Committee was in substantial agreement with the findings in Illinois and its survey of conditions in New York together with its general observations on State administration constitute an important contribution to the problem of State reorganization. The conclusions of this Committee have been summarized in the following manner:

- “1. State administration is a collection of offices, boards, and other agencies which have been created from time to time by legislative act without consideration being given to the desirability of grouping all related work in one department.
- “2. The board or commission type of organization for purely administrative work is generally inefficient, owing to the division of powers and the absence of initiative and responsibility. This applies with less force to departments in which there are important quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative functions combined with administrative functions. Boards have been successful in many cases in carrying out advisory and inspectional functions and in the general supervision of education. *Ex-officio* boards are almost never effective.
- “3. Widely scattered and independent agencies of state government cannot be effectively supervised and controlled either by the legislature or the Governor.
- “4. When such a large number of agencies is independent of the Governor, he cannot be held responsible to the voters for an efficient and economical management of public business.”<sup>9</sup>

The same general tone characterized the commission reports in other States. These impressive indictments of existing administrative methods, coupled with constructive recommendations for improvement, soon removed the question from the realm of theoretical proposals, and administrative reorganiza-

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 742.

<sup>9</sup> From the Report of the New York Reconstruction Commission as condensed by Haines and Haines, *Ibid.* p. 336.



tion became in turn a definite legislative program. Leadership was often found in a progressive and energetic candidate for Governor, and usually through executive rather than legislative initiative the most effective plans of reorganization have been accomplished.

The Civil Administrative Code enacted in Illinois July 1, 1917, under sponsorship of Governor Lowden and the Ohio Administrative Code of April 26, 1921, completed through the leadership of Governor Harry L. Davis, represent substantial fulfilments of the recommendations of the respective State commissions on Efficiency and Economy. In both States a complete reorganization of administration has been effected and a simplification and unity realized which is a significant contribution to American State government. The principles followed have been, in the main, a consolidation of all services into a small number of departments each with a director appointed by the Governor and a closer relationship established between this latter official and the administration of the State of which he is deemed to be the responsible head.

In Illinois<sup>10</sup> some fifty boards and commissions were consolidated into nine main departments as follows: Finance, Agriculture, Labor, Mines and Minerals, Public Works and Buildings, Public Welfare, Public Health, Trade and Commerce, and Registration and Education. Each department has as its head a director appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate who makes the rules and regulations for his department, fixes the salaries and defines the duties of his subordinates. Associated with each departmental head is an assistant director and such bureau chiefs as are necessary to administer the affairs of the department together with its permanent personnel. These subordinate officials are appointed by the Governor in the same manner as the director, but are under the immediate control of the heads of the department. The general principle is followed of having a single officer instead of a board in charge of executive functions. The most conspicuous exceptions to this rule were the provisions for a Tax Commission, an Indus-

---

<sup>10</sup> An excellent summary of the Illinois Administrative Code is given by Matthews, IX SUPPLEMENT TO THE NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW, No. 11. *Ibid.*

trial Commission, a Public Utilities Commission, and a Normal School Board consisting of salaried members, appointed by the Governor and Senate for a four or six year term, who function largely independent of the departments. The board form of organization was retained for the above services by reason of the quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial or advisory functions they are required to perform. Their financial supervision is, however, under the director of finance who has general control of the budget. The organization of the department of Public Works and Buildings is a typical one and has grouped under it the following officials: The director; assistant director, superintendent of highways; chief highway engineer; supervising architect; supervising engineer; superintendent of waterways; superintendent of printing; superintendent of purchases and supplies; superintendent of parks.

A feature of the Illinois plan which has been especially commended in practice was the establishment of a centralized purchasing agency. The purchase of most of the supplies required by the State departments and by the charitable, penal and reformatory institutions is concentrated in the above department of Public Works and Buildings under a superintendent appointed for this purpose. Through this arrangement an economy and responsibility in purchasing has been accomplished which has demonstrated beyond question the advantages of this particular reform.

The Administrative Code of Ohio which is the most recent of the various State reorganization measures follows in principle the legislation in Illinois with such modifications as were necessary to meet special conditions within that State. The experience of similar codes operating in other States over a period of three or four years afforded a basis for observation and improvement yet it is noteworthy that the general principle of consolidation was followed in Ohio no less consistently than elsewhere.<sup>11</sup> An outline of the departments organized in Ohio

---

<sup>11</sup> The general principles governing reorganization recommended by the Ohio Commission were the following:

1. The governor, who is elected by the people, would be the responsible head of the State government and would possess power and authority commensurate with his responsibility. The term of the governor

is given below together with the chief work assigned to each of these departments.

Department of Finance: budget, financial control, purchases and printing, tax commission.

Department of Commerce: supervision over banks, building and loan associations, state fire marshal, insurance, inspection of oil, supervision over securities, public utilities.

Department of Highways and Public Works: work of present department of public works, highways, state architect and engineer, supervision over purchase of real estate, planning of all building construction, custody of capitol buildings and grounds.

Department of Agriculture: animal industry, fish and game, foods and dairies, plant industry, state fair.

---

would be extended from two to four years and all department heads would have the same term as the governor except members of boards with overlapping terms.

2. The auditor, who is also elected by the people, would constitute a continuing check upon the work of the governor and his subordinates. The investigations of the auditor would include not only financial audits, but criticism of operation and results.

3. Departments and boards performing work of a similar or related character would be grouped together into a major department; the various functions would constitute bureaus or divisions operated under an accountable chief who would report to the head of the department. The department head would be directly responsible to the governor.

4. Departments having to do largely with matters of policy would be controlled by boards in order to insure the application of group judgment. Boards would be retained for the health department, industrial commission, public utilities commission, department of education and state board of welfare.

The following methods are outlined for making the governor the responsible head of the State government in fact as well as in name:

1. All department heads would be appointed by the governor and be directly responsible to him without the confirmation of the senate. This involves an amendment to the constitution permitting the appointment of the secretary of state, attorney general and treasurer by the governor.

2. A reduction in the number of independent departments, offices, boards and commissions is recommended. The number of elective offices would be reduced from six to three and the activities now performed by thirty-six independent boards and commissions would be combined into thirteen major departments. The governor would be relieved of the necessity of supervising and coordinating the work of thirty-six departments. Staff meetings of department heads would become possible by this method; he could obtain a bird's-eye view of all of the State's activities. *REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATION, Ohio, 1921, p. 6.*

Department of Health: All the present health activities of the State.

Department of Industrial Relations: all of the present activities of the industrial commission, including factory inspection, labor, statistics, mines, workmen's compensation.

Department of Education: general supervision over professional licensing boards, film censorship, all of the present work of the department of education, libraries. The director of education is made *ex-officio* a member of the board of trustees of each of the normal schools and of each of the three universities.<sup>12</sup>

In Ohio, as in Illinois, the Tax Commission, the Industrial Commission and the Public Utilities Commission have been left intact but are associated with their corresponding departments for administrative purposes. In order to make this co-ordination effective, the director of finance is made secretary of the Tax Commission, the director of commerce secretary of the Public Utilities Commission, and the director of industrial relations is secretary of the Industrial Commission. Unlike the Illinois Code, the Ohio measure makes little provision for advisory boards but authorizes the departments with the consent of the Governor to create such boards in cases where it is deemed desirable. Another divergence from the Illinois system is the provision in Ohio for the appointment of subordinate officials by departmental heads rather than by the Governor. This is in keeping with the theory that heads of departments are responsible to the Governor for the conduct of their departments and should be given wide latitude in the choice of their associates.

With respect to educational organization, it has been the practice of all the States to leave the higher educational institutions each with its independent board. In Illinois all the State normal schools were brought under the supervision of a single board but in Ohio no such plan of consolidation was adopted. The director of education is ordinarily made *ex-officio* a member of each of the institutional boards.

A modifying factor in all attempts made thus far at administrative reorganization has been the limitations imposed by the

---

<sup>12</sup> Summary given by Dodd, W. F., Administrative Reorganization in Ohio, XV AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, No. 3, p. 381.

State constitutions. These restrictions exist in the form of constitutional provisions for a number of elective officials, some of whom are heads of important administrative services; in addition there are constitutional provisions creating boards and commissions filled either by popularly elected officials or by persons chosen by the State legislature; and, in more than half the States, the Governors have a two year term while many of their appointees hold over through the term of succeeding Governors. As a consequence of these constitutional regulations, many Governors come into office nominally responsible for State administration but in reality deprived of practical direction. For political reasons they are unable to exercise any substantial control over departments headed by elective officials and in the case of appointees from preceding terms there is a similar limitation on executive supervision. In New York in 1915 an effort was made to effect administrative consolidation in connection with constitutional revision but the work of the New York convention was rejected by the people. In Massachusetts, however, in 1918 a constitutional amendment providing for consolidation was adopted and reorganization carried into effect by legislative act in 1919. In Illinois and Ohio the administrative codes are legislative in character and as a consequence a number of important administrative departments and some statutory commissions are still exempt from effective control by the Governor. In Ohio there is a constitutional provision for a superintendent of public instruction appointed by the Governor for a period of four years—twice the length of the latter's tenure. But under the administrative code the former official is made director of the department of education, and as noted above, certain departmental heads are made secretaries to administrative commissions which bodies by reason of the peculiar functions they fulfill are exempt from the jurisdiction of any department. Through such arrangements as these co-ordination is sought where consolidation has been impractical. In the opinion of some authorities, however, the presence of constitutional officers or boards independent of the Governor react unfavorably on State administration especially with regard to expenditure. Thus says Professor Matthews:

"With reference to the constitutional elective officers, the experience with the budget of 1919 shows that they are in a position of practical independence of the governor, who cannot control the estimates nor the appropriations of their departments. The director of finance may undertake to revise their estimates, but, as stated, they may and do go over his head and even over the head of the governor direct to the legislative appropriation committees and secure increased appropriations. On account of the strong political position of these officers, the governor and director of finance do not care to oppose their requests. The secretary of state and the attorney general especially are important leaders in party organization."<sup>13</sup>

In the light of such experience it may confidently be asserted that there is an intimate and necessary relationship between successful budget operation and administrative consolidation. Under a system of disintegrated administration it is impossible for budget authorities to appraise properly the estimates and requests of various services or to be assured that the efficiency and economy in expenditures is practiced which it is the purpose of the budget system to promote. An administrative organization which maintains a vast multiplicity of separate boards, offices and commissions may well present to the Governor a problem quite as elusive and complex as that which confronted State legislatures prior to the adoption of the executive budget system. There is, of course, some advantage in a compilation of estimates revised by a central authority but the value and equity of this revision is contingent upon an intimate acquaintance with the needs and conduct of the services which are thus controlled.

### III.

In Virginia the movement for the reorganization of State administration is at the present time a topic of much importance and discussion with prospects of becoming a definite political program. In 1916 the General Assembly provided for the appointment of an Economy and Efficiency Commission "charged with the duty of making a careful and detailed study of the

---

<sup>13</sup> Administrative Reorganization in Illinois, .IX SUPPLEMENT TO THE NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW, No. 11, p. 756.

organization and methods of the State and local government . . . and reporting to the next General Assembly in what way the State and local government can be more efficiently and economically organized and administered". The Commission was composed of one member of the Senate, two members of the House of Delegates and two citizens appointed by the Governor.<sup>14</sup> A report of its investigations and recommendations were submitted to the General Assembly in 1918.<sup>15</sup>

The most conspicuous feature of the Commission's report was its submission of a proposed budget law carrying the endorsement of Governor-elect Westmoreland Davis, a proposal which was the basis of the budget measure subsequently enacted. In addition, the Commission assembled much valuable data on the organization of the executive, legislative, judicial, and administrative branches of the government. On account of lack of funds, however, the investigations were of a limited nature and the Commission was unable to make the extensive surveys of the administrative services which are essential to comprehensive recommendations. Its most detailed report was in connection with the Public School system. On the general conditions of administration within the State, however, the report of the Commission is of peculiar importance. In this connection it was observed that:

"Authority and responsibility are diffused instead of being placed where a definite official can be held to account for the administration of the State's affairs. The people elect a group of purely administrative officers who are responsible in actual practice to no one, these officials being accountable in the same way that the Governor is, but are not of sufficient importance to the average citizen for him even to remember the name of the official two weeks after the elections. Another group of similar officials are elected by the General Assembly. There are next a vast variety of offices, some of a purely local character, that are filled by

---

<sup>14</sup> The Commission was composed of Senator P. H. Drewry; Representatives George L. Browning and J. Calvin Moss from the House of Delegates; and Hon. Richard Evelyn Byrd and Mr. Leroy Hodges as citizen members.

<sup>15</sup> Senate Document No. 8. SENATE JOURNAL AND DOCUMENTS, Virginia, 1918.

the Governor. Numerous special boards, commissions, bureaus and other agencies, some exercising large powers, are tacked on here and there to our governmental structure, and duplication of function and overlapping of work and powers occur in many instances”.

In support of the above statement the Commission prepared a diagram illustrating the disintegration of the present administrative system and the multiplicity of services thus revealed showed emphatically the need of consolidation. Administration in Virginia has developed in a fashion similar to that in other States through the creation by legislative enactment of numerous administrative and regulative boards but the problem of co-ordinating the work of these and their supervision by some responsible authority is one yet to be worked out.

Further interest in proposals for administrative reorganization has been aroused during the 1922 session of the General Assembly. Governor Davis in his message to that body expressed his convictions on the necessity of simplification in the following words:

“In order to have an efficient government economically administered the affairs of the State should be conducted as are those of a business concern successfully managed, and the Governor should be in effect the State manager. There should be heads of departments responsible to the Governor and removable by him. . . .

“There are numerous boards which are large and inefficient in their organization and have the management of the institutions. The Governor of Virginia has no authority over them save the right of removal for cause, even in the case of officers appointed by him.”

Indorsing the resolution of the Virginia Conference on governmental efficiency held in Richmond November 20, 1921, the Governor continued:

“My study of the government of Virginia and the experience that I have had as Governor has convinced me that great gain and efficiency may be had, and much of the taxpayer's money saved by the simplification of our State government in the merger of departments, the reducing of the number of State officers and in the incidental saving of expenditures.



"I recommend that a Commission be appointed on administrative reorganization of State government in Virginia." <sup>16</sup>

The incoming Governor, E. Lee Trinkle in his inaugural address advocated what he termed the "standardization of departments"; the reorganization of the State Highway Department into a commission consisting of five members, the chairman of which should be a business man who should appoint a competent civil engineer to handle the technical work of the Commission; and an extension of the authority and responsibility of the State Purchasing Commission.<sup>17</sup> On January 16 the House of Delegates went on record as favoring the merger of State departments and the abolition of unnecessary offices, and appointed a committee to investigate and report on the advisability of consolidation. A joint legislative committee on the subject was formed and reported to the House of Delegates on February 10, recommending a comprehensive merger of the State administrative services and the abolition of certain offices. It recommended in addition the calling of a constitutional convention in order that a comprehensive reconstruction of State administration could be effected.<sup>18</sup>

There is beyond question need for a substantial reorganization of administration in Virginia. Its nature and scope is a matter to be determined only after a proper survey of existing methods in order that there be no abolition or impairment of services which are essential and which are already functioning in an efficient manner. It is a program which should be preceded, furthermore, by a careful investigation of the reconstruction measures introduced in other States some of which have been operating over a period sufficiently long to have produced results of a conclusive nature. From this experience much of positive value can be obtained and changes of questionable merit can be avoided. In the event of constitutional revision, the problem of administrative reorganization would naturally come forward as an important issue and an opportunity would be afforded to remove restrictions which now possibly present ob-

---

<sup>16</sup> RICHMOND TIMES-DISPATCH, January 12, 1922.

<sup>17</sup> TIMES-DISPATCH, February 2, 1922.

<sup>18</sup> TIMES-DISPATCH, February 11, 1922.

stacles to desirable reform. On the general purpose of reorganization, it may be said, that the program contemplates no further extension of State activity, it creates no new duties or functions for the State, nor, on the other hand, does it necessarily imply a decrease in the existing scope of State authority. Its primary purpose is to introduce a proper method of carrying on the administrative affairs of the State and as such it will doubtless provoke an increasing amount of public interest and discussion.

*Bruce Williams.*

UNIVERSITY, VIRGINIA.